



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,398	06/19/2006	Eldad Torbati	64030(303625)	6381
21874 7590 01/20/2010 EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, HIEN NGOC				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3768				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/20/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 10/549,398	Applicant(s) TORBATI, ELDAD
Examiner HIEN NGUYEN	Art Unit 3768

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 January 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 24-29, 31-54, 56, 58, 60, 61, 65-70, 72-79, 81, 82 and 84.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 14, 16, 18, 21-23, 30, 55, 57, 59, 62-64, 71, 80 and 83.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Long V Le/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3768

/H. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 3768

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues reference EP 1,219,278 alone and in view of other references (Tamarkin, Ella, Hansjurgens, Cosman, Lia) does not teach and provide a motivation for transmitting ultrasound wave at a minimum intensity of 1.5 W/cm². Applicant's argument is not persuasive because the ultrasound system discloses by EP 1,219,278 and in view of Ella is capable of operating at an intensity of 0.5W/cm² to 10 W/cm². Further, Ella discloses in claim 100 that the ultrasound system is adapted for treating cellulite and fat. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify EP 1,219,278 with Ella in order to operate the ultrasound system at a minimum intensity of 1.5W/cm² for cellulite/fat treatment because this is a minimum intensity for breaking down fat. Applicant argues it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify EP 1,219,278 with Tamarkin because Tamarkin's device is intended for achieving a fundamentally different purpose. Applicant's argument is not persuasive because Tamarkin discloses an interferential electrical stimulation apparatus for treatment of skin and muscle (see [0014], [0021], [0027] and claim 23). Skin and muscle are part of the body perimeter. Tamarkin provides the same function of stimulating the body or the region of treatment as the ultrasound system in EP 1,219,278 therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the two references. Applicant argues Tamarkin does not disclose simultaneous application of ultrasound and interferential stimulation to the region of treatment. Applicant's argument is not persuasive because examiner relies on EP 1,219,278 combines with Tamarkin to teach a simultaneous application of ultrasound and interferential stimulation to the region of treatment.